UNITY

FREEDOM, FELLOWSHIP AND CHARACTER IN RELIGION

Evangelism

By Jesse H. Holmes

Notes from Seattle - - *Sydney Strong*

Notes on a Trip to the Orient—No. II - - - - *Dorothy Walton Binder*

"What Christians Should Remember and Jews Forget" - - *Stephen S. Wise*

Two Eminent Living Americans - - - - - - - - *Taraknath Das*

Washington and Free Trade - *Edwin D. Mead*

Book Reviews - *John Haynes Holmes, Robert C. Schaller*

VOLUME CXVI NUMBER 1

Chicago, September 2, 1935

PRICE FIFTEEN CENTS

UNITY

Established 1878
(Jenkin Lloyd Jones, Editor, 1880-1918)

Published Semi-Monthly *Subscription $3.00*
Until Further Notice *Single Copies 15 cents*

UNITY PUBLISHING CO., Abraham Lincoln Centre, 700 Oakwood Blvd., Chicago, Ill.
"Entered as Second-Class Matter May 24, 1935, at the Post Office at Chicago, Illinois, under Act of March 3, 1879."

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES, *Editor* CURTIS W. REESE, *Managing Editor*

Board of Directors

MRS. S. O. LEVINSON, President
MRS. E. L. LOBDELL, Vice-President
MRS. IRWIN S. ROSENFELS, Treasurer
MRS. FRANCIS NEILSON
MRS. O. T. KNIGHT
MR. IRWIN S. ROSENFELS
MR. C. W. REESE
MISS MATILDA C. SCHAFF
MRS. E. E. SMITH
MR. FRANCIS NEILSON
Secretary: MAY JOHNSON

Editorial Contributors

W. WALDEMAR W. ARGOW
DOROTHY WALTON BINDER
RAYMOND B. BRAGG
EDMUND B. CHAFFEE
PERCY M. DAWSON
ALBERT C. DIEFFENBACH
JAMES A. FAIRLEY
ZONA GALE
A. EUSTACE HAYDON
JESSE H. HOLMES
LOUIS L. MANN
JOSEPH ERNEST MCAFEE
H. R. MUSSEY
M. C. OTTO
ALSON H. ROBINSON
ROBERT C. SCHALLER
CLARENCE R. SKINNER
SYDNEY STRONG
JABEZ T. SUNDERLAND
ARTHUR L. WEATHERLY
JAMES H. WEST

Poetry Editors

LUCIA TRENT
RALPH CHEYNEY

Foreign Representatives

AUSTRALIA—CHARLES STRONG
AUSTRIA—STEFAN ZWEIG
BULGARIA—P. M. MATTHÉEFF
ENGLAND—HARRISON BROWN
FRED HANKINSON
REGINALD REYNOLDS
FRANCE—G. DEMARTIAL
ROMAIN ROLLAND
GERMANY—THEODOR HAHN
INDIA—RABINDRANATH TAGORE
JAPAN—NOBUICHIRO IMAOKA
PALESTINE—HANS KOHN
RUSSIA—ALINA HUEBSCH

Contents

EDITORIAL—
Notes 3
Evangelism—JESSE H. HOLMES 6

ARTICLES—
Notes from Seattle—SYDNEY STRONG 7
Notes on a Trip to the Orient—No. II—DOROTHY WALTON BINDER 8
What Christians Should Remember and Jews Forget—STEPHEN S. WISE 11
Two Eminent Living Americans—TARAKNATH DAS 12
Washington and Free Trade—EDWIN D. MEAD 14

POETRY—
To the Women of Italy—LUCIA TRENT 3
Calling—ROBERT WHITAKER 14

THE STUDY TABLE—
A New Plea for Liberty—JOHN HAYNES HOLMES 15
Unfinished Symphony—ROBERT C. SCHALLER 15

CORRESPONDENCE—
Dictatorship Evils Greater Than Those of Democracy—ALICE STONE BLACKWELL 16
In Berlin—EMILY G. BALCH 16
Will America Remain Out of War?—MYRON W. JACOBS 16
Militarism in Education—GEORGE A. COE, JOHN NEVIN SAYER, NORMAN THOMAS, OSWALD GARRISON VILLARD 17
Killing Men to Get Trade—LUCIA AMES MEAD 17
Outlaw War!—MAMIE SCHELLENBERG 18
Best in Forty Years—T. J. DANSINGBURG 18
About Hero Worship—ALICE G. HARRIS 18
Citizens May Register Opposition to War—WILLIAM FLOYD 18

THE FIELD—
Mr. Holmes's Play 2
Committee on Militarism—AGATHA VARELA 2

The Field

"The world is my country, to do good is my Religion."

Mr. Holmes's Play

"If This Be Treason," a three-act peace play by John Haynes Holmes and Reginald Lawrence, has been taken by the Theatre Guild for immediate production at the opening of the new season in New York.

"If This Be Treason," originally entitled "The Purple Testament," was given a try-out production this summer at the Country Playhouse in Westport, Connecticut. Acted by a brilliant professional cast, it was received with great acclaim. Mr. Robert Garland, well-known dramatic critic of the New York *World-Telegram,* called it "the best peace-on-earth - good - will - toward - men drama" he had ever seen. The New York *Times* referred to it as "a thrilling anti-war play." The scene is set in Washington, on inauguration day, and presents the dilemma of a pacifist president, beset by a war crisis, who refuses to fight. How he works out his problem, and brings peace to nations already engaged in war, is the theme of the drama.

Produced by the Theatre Guild and directed by Mr. Harry Wagstaff Gribble, himself a well-known playwright, "If This Be Treason" will have a distinguished premiere. The opening night, soon to be announced, is set for the end of September.

Committee on Militarism in Education—Pioneer

BY AGATHA VARELA

The Committee on Militarism in Education is facing the greatest challenge in its history. With the War Department Appropriation Bill for 1936 reaching the unprecedented peace time total of $401,998,179, a million dollar increase is provided for new ROTC units (probably 113) in schools and colleges. It is expected that most of the new units will be established in public high schools with probably two-thirds operating on a compulsory rather than on an elective basis. This will mean, according to the CME calculations, that from 30,000 to 60,000 students will be added to the 148,000 already subjected to military

(*Continued on Page* 18)

UNITY

"He Hath Made of One All Nations of Men"

Volume CXVI MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 2, 1935 No. 1

TO THE WOMEN OF ITALY

("Ten Italian soldiers are dying from fever in Africa every day," Press item)

Your men are slowly sinking under
The African sun whose burning thunder
Shovels them into desert sand
For the "glory and pride" of your native land.
Will you, oh mothers, let them die
So that Mussolini's flag may fly
Across a country not his to seize?
How vindicate these blasphemies?
It is a woman's time for words
When men are doomed like slaughtered herds!
It is a woman's time to cry:
"No man shall make my children die!"

LUCIA TRENT.

We referred, in our last issue, to the problem of the Constitution in its relation to progressive policies of government. We stated our conviction that the Constitution is a flexible document, and that there was no reason why we should not be able to carry out any and all methods of social reconstruction without the sacrifice of those peculiar institutions of democracy—states to counterbalance the nation, a legislature and a judiciary to match the executive, etc.—which mark the difference between liberty and "totalitarianism." The idea that we must scrap the Constitution, or even amend it in any drastic fashion, seems to us ridiculous. Yet it is just this idea which is apparently taking root in the minds of the Rooseveltians. In which case we shall witness the extraordinary spectacle of the old-fashioned and hopelessly reactionary Republican Party defending those basic principles of freedom which have for so long been central in every progressive political movement in this country, and the Democratic Party attacking these very principles which alone stand in the way of an out-and-out Fascist state in America. We can imagine no greater irony than this kind of a conflict. Yet it strikes us as all to the good that, in this next presidential campaign, we shall have something more serious to talk about than the personalities of candidates, the division of the spoils of office, and the other insignificant contentions which ordinarily monopolize the political field. The Constitution! Can it be used for the accomplishment of our new purposes of social economy, or must it be cast into the rubbish heap, and a highly-centralized type of government, without reservations or safeguards, be established in its place? We can conceive of no more wholesome experience for the American people than the discussion and settlement of this clear-cut issue. It would lead to a constitutional debate comparable to that conducted by Webster and Calhoun in the old slavery days, and would decide a question which would determine the destiny of this republic for a century. Great days may well be on before. The year 1936 may mark a crisis in American history as great as that of 1787 or 1861.

The result of the Rhode Island election continues to reverberate like a mighty crash of thunder rolling among the hills. Various factors contributed to make this event a sensation of the first magnitude—the representative character of the constituency which was rural as well as city, the clear-cut conduct of the campaign on New Deal issues, and the terrific overturn from a huge Democratic majority only nine months ago to a large Republican majority today. Attempts to explain away the outcome were utterly futile—it was simply and solely a smashing administration defeat, full of foreboding for the presidential election a year hence. As a mere matter of history, it is interesting to recall that Rhode Island was the last of the thirteen original colonies to accept the Constitution and enter the Union, the little state hanging back lest she lose her liberties. Now Rhode Island is the first to strike at the New Deal, presumably lest she lose her liberties again! What all this means for the year ahead cannot be said in any detail. But surely it is as plain as the nose on one's face that President Roosevelt's personal and political popularity is definitely on the wane, and his re-election for a second term in the White House as dubious today as it seemed certain yesterday. If Huey Long has really made up his mind to run for the presidency, as the New York *Times* definitely announced three weeks ago, then we believe that Roosevelt's defeat will be inevitable. A divided Democratic Party would bring the same result in 1936 that it did in 1860. Of course a lot of things may happen before election day. Huey Long may not run. If business recovery really continues and becomes impressive, the President will get the credit. A Supreme Court decision against the

AAA, fatal as it would be to all New Deal policies, would rally the farmers to a kind of uprising on the President's behalf. The expenditure of the PWA billions will continue through all this next year, and sow the seed for the President's harvesting of votes. The case has not yet been closed by any manner of means! But Rhode Island proves that what we thought was going to be Roman triumph is rather going to be a battle to the death. Those who would survive the excitements of the 1936 campaign must have strong hearts.

The passage of the Social Security Bill marks a momentous date in American history. It is an achievement of political leadership which will undoubtedly be remembered and acclaimed when everything else in the Roosevelt administration is perhaps forgotten. Even now, when the Social Security plan is not yet under way, the failure of the NRA seems insignificant in the light of this great triumph. Like everything else, apparently, in the Roosevelt regime, the actual Bill is badly drawn and ill-considered. It represents improvisation rather than careful planning, a gesture rather than a goal. But it is the principle and not the exact policy which is important here. Years ago, enlightened European nations made the economic security of their citizens a responsibility and therefore a function of society. Now, at the President's suggestion, and under his guidance, the United States is taking this step toward true civilization which should have been taken when days were prosperous rather than depressed. Under the terms of the Roosevelt Act, in addition to the assistance given to dependent and crippled children, mothers, the indigent disabled and the blind, provision is made for nationwide old-age assistance, old-age pensions, and unemployment insurance. In the range of its application, this Social Security Bill is probably the most comprehensive ever enacted. At one stride it attempts to bring this nation abreast of the best achievements of European nations through at least two generations gone. Making up for lost time! What wonder that the New York *Times,* in its August 11th editorial, describes this Bill as "a measure of great historic importance!" What is here begun, we believe, will be carried on until the ills of our modern industrial system have been reduced to the utmost minimum, and then on again until this system has itself at last yielded to economic justice and thus insecurity been altogether done away. We again turn to Mr. Roosevelt, alone responsible for this legislation, and salute him for what he has here so splendidly achieved.

The Tax Bill is certainly a mess. A mess from President Roosevelt's original ill-considered proposal to the last feeble and futile flounderings of House and Senate! But we may well take example of it, for huge taxes, in brackets high and low, must come in due course, and thus cannot in the end be dodged—nor shoved over on to the rich, either! That the administration ever seriously intended to start this taxation business before next year's election is not to be believed. But after the election the avalanche will sweep down upon us. For four years the piper will have been playing his wildly extravagant tunes, and not later than 1937 he will ask to be paid. In other words —to abandon figures of speech and handle figures of money!—the President has been pouring out billions with a lavishness unprecedented in the history of mankind, and now the bill for same has got to be met. And there's no way to meet it except by piling on the taxes. The experience will be about as pleasant as a major operation without anaesthetics, and how the people will yell! It is our guess that, when the day of reckoning really comes, and the citizens of this republic begin to comprehend the prison of debt into which they have been thrust, the gulf of unpopularity into which the President will be hurled will something more than counter-balance the height of popularity to which he was flung three years ago. This spending orgy, based upon an idea of swift business recovery which was never anything better than a chimera, was madness from the beginning. Any man, any public, with any sense would have known it. But we'll know it all right when the taxes are fashioned into a yoke which will hold us bound in slavery for generations. Or—*will* it hold us bound? Will this indebtedness ever really be paid? The German people wouldn't stand for the reparations. Why should we stand for these Rooseveltian debts? This is a question which may be asked and answered by our children in a way to make a U. S. government bond look sicker than a Roosevelt promise to pay in gold.

There are a lot of things about this country that we like. In the criticism of faults and failings which it is the duty of all sensitive citizens to visit upon America, it is easy to forget those virtues, so common as to be inconspicuous, which make this land so good a place to live in. Every now and then something happens to remind us of our blessings. Thus, there was that episode, some week's ago, of Gropper's cartoon in *Vanity Fair* of the Japanese Emperor. Japan didn't like it, and made representations of protest to the State Department in Washington. Whereupon the State Department, expressing regret that anything should occur to disturb good feeling between nations, proceeded to point out to the Japanese Ambassador that the government in this country has no control of the press which is free to print whatever it pleases, in bad taste and

good taste alike! Shortly after this episode, there took place in New York, in the Harlem district, a monster demonstration against Italy's policy in Abyssinia. Two parades, one white and one colored, marched through different parts of the city, and then converged and united for a great mass meeting in a public square. For hours denunciations of Italy poured forth from white and Negro lips, fiery resolutions were addressed to Rome and Washington, and a good time was had by all. Here was liberty at its best—the right of a free people to rise up, without interference from their government, and say their say in public affairs. It did our heart good! About this same time there came over the radio Huey Long's attack upon President Roosevelt. This attack, a half hour long, was vulgar, vituperative, vicious, as fierce an assault as we have ever heard upon the head of a great nation. It offended us, angered us. At the same time, altogether apart from the personalities involved, it pleased us that in this country, alone of all countries in the world, perhaps, the radio was still so free that it could carry such a speech as this. Yes, in many ways, this nation is all right. Thank God for the United States of America!

The India Bill, recently passed by the British Parliament after eight months of debate, marks one more chapter in the history of "perfidious Albion." Offered piously—and hypocritically—as a long step forward on the road to Indian freedom, the Bill actually represents, to quote the New York *Nation,* "a strengthening of British control in India." The features of self-government, so-called, are nothing but the shadow of that substance which remains the Empire's despotic rule of a helpless people. The Indian states, for example, utterly subservient to the Crown, are given a predominance of power in the new government out of all proportion to their population which is only 25 per cent of the whole. The Hindus, *per contra,* a majority of the people, are given only a third of the representatives in the Assembly, and these indirectly chosen by the provincial legislatures. The three central and decisive functions of government—the issue of currency, the determination of foreign policy, and the program of natural defense—are all "reserved" to the British rule. In addition, the Governor-General is clothed with all manner of "discretionary" powers, such as the right of absolute veto, which make him in very truth "the monarch of all he surveys." The bill is a dark tragedy of disillusionment and defeat, lightened not a particle by the fact that it is associated with the name of MacDonald, and won the opposition of Churchill and the die-hards. Its real significance is to be found in the plight of the Indian liberals, who insisted on going along with Britain, only to find themselves now repudiated and betrayed. Even Sastri has washed his hands of this new government measure, and thus confessed failure of his policy of "reasonableness." Gandhi was wiser. He saw with perfect clearness that nothing could come of any compromise, and that freedom therefore could only be won by resistance, sacrifice, and suffering. When the moderates stood out against him, he characteristically stepped aside, turned to the Untouchables and earthquake relief, and waited for time to justify his course. Everything he feared and foreboded has now come to pass. The fight for freedom must be begun anew. We wait the early hour of Gandhi's return to the political leadership of his people!

Sir William Watson, dead on August 13th last, was in the great tradition of English letters, and the sole survivor in twentieth century literature, perhaps, of that liberal spirit of moral idealism which made the Victorian era immortal. Not since Shelley, unless it be Swineburne, has a poet so passionately and eloquently voiced the indignation of the righteous heart against injustice, cruelty, oppression. He it was who branded the Sultan Abdul Hamid to all eternity as "Abdul the Damned," denounced England's neglect of the stricken Armenians, espoused the cause of the Boers when the Empire was conquering their little country, appealed for Irish freedom when Erin bore the hate of all patriotic Englishmen, and in one of the savagest satires since Pope ("The Woman with the Serpent's Tongue") held up to furious scorn the wife of the Prime Minister. Had Watson learned to restrain his passion or subdue his idealism, he would undoubtedly have rivalled Kipling in popular favor, and won the Laureatship as the crown of his career. His "Wordsworth's Grave," his ode on the death of Tennyson, his lament over the passing of Edward VII, were poems of immortal splendor which made him the inspired bard of a great people. But his spirit never tamed itself to obedience and conformity, and at the critical moment it was the insignificant and rather ridiculous Alfred Austin who received the royal favor. Rapid and tragic, and utterly discreditable to the English people, was Watson's passing into the shadows of obscurity and finally of wretched poverty. His endorsement of the Great War, and some noble poems written in the national crisis, won him a knighthood, but brought him no restoration of popular favor. In addition to his reckless spirit, there was, of course, the coming in his later years of a new literary style and manner to discredit and at last conceal him. With the strange free verse eccentricities of the post-war periods he had no sympathy, and of them made no use. He knew they were the sure signs of literary degeneracy—a "waste land"—in which men perished of barrenness—and he refused to be misled. Watson spoke the language of England's greatest poets, his voice was the voice of Wordsworth, Tennyson, and Arnold. If this music

was no longer acceptable to the world—well, then so much the worse for the world! He would sing on, though no one heeded. And he did—with the result that he left a body of English verse which in due time will be recovered, and enroll Sir William Watson in the proud company of England's noblest dead.

Evangelism

Many of us must have observed the difficulty on the part of even the most deeply religious and consecrated men, when confronted by a demand to tell "what you believe." It is a real difficulty because there is no phrase or formula which will answer it: not ten commandments, not an apostle's creed, not thirty-nine articles. Our faith is always an appeal to experience, not a demand for assent. Ultimately it is a recognition of an underlying will to attain certain great human values and to embody them in human institutions. Deeply and beyond all question we long for an enriched and ennobled life for mankind: for more beauty, more truth, more love, more happiness. To accomplish this end we have made governments, religions, schools. There is no other end worth seeking. What seem to be other ends are nothing else than fragments—"broken lights"—of this more abundant life.

Historically men have continually striven to reduce this deepest of all demands of our human spirit to "phrases and formulas." But these have never been final and never can be so long as we are fallible and so long as language is feeble and uncertain. How faint and far away are the formal creeds of Christianity! How meaningless for practical life are even the beatitudes; the Lord's Prayer—to say nothing of the warnings of the Hebrew prophets, the aphorisms of Buddha, the platitudes of Confucius! Nothing less than hot living pleas out of the ecstasies and miseries of life can reach the hearts of living men. Canned prophecy, however wholesome, can never wholly replace the fresh; it lacks vitamines. And as "phrases and formulas" fail, so also do institutions fail. How stiff and ugly are the Hebrew priesthood, the Mohammedan theocracy, the Christian sectaries! Each was once vital and alive; each stiffens into rigidity and loses life and meaning when it becomes rich and powerful.

So "heretics" have turned away from preserved prophecy and sought the word of God in the hot "concern" of creative life. Not the Bible, however precious, not creeds, however embalmed in powerful institutions, not the apostolic succession, not the church nor the state, but the light within, the immediate Divine Guidance, the warmth of this intimate spirit, the fragrance of flowering life, the touch of the Father's hand, the flavor of manna from above, the music of the spheres, the experience felt, tasted, smelled, heard, seen; only these have authority—only these bring us into contact with that chief imperative—God. Our Christian sects have not been loyal to this ideal. Again and again they have made themselves into ecclesiastic bodies, and their church buildings into "sacred places." Again and again individuals have made claims of authority, instead of humbly seeking in others the divine element they find in themselves. But it has never fitted essential Christian teachings and we may be grateful that it has not succeeded. "Loyalty to loyalty" is the only loyalty we may demand of any.

It is evident from the above statement that the formal Christian Church is rather an accidental affair, and should never be or claim to be more or other than an association of friends. Those on whom we must depend to extend our religion are mostly outside of membership. The accident of birth-membership carries with it no probability even, of that rare capacity to bring to unopened or dim eyes the visions of the light within. The extension of vital religion is far other than increase in membership. Not one of the founders of Christianity was born a Christian; not with any great expectation should we look to our membership to supply our present-day prophets. Our organized groups have their value no doubt, but it is not primarily in the extension of the Christian ideal. "The wind bloweth where it listeth:—so is every one, born of the Spirit." And as he probably will not be of our membership so will he not speak our language. We need not expect Calvin's phrases, Wesley's phrases—nay nor Jesus' phrases—from his lips. Out of his own life and his own experience will he speak; perhaps harsh, unwelcome words, perhaps strange, unwelcome ideas. Our part is to watch for the "faithful prophet," to welcome him—to share his stripes, to stand close to his cross, to acclaim his resurrection. He may come from among the great as Isaiah did or from the herdsmen as did Amos. He may be called a priest like Jeremiah or a traitor as was Ezekiel—an atheist, a heretic, a communist, a Bolshevik. But let us not fail to hear the noble music when it comes, even sounding through the storm; to see the vision though shrouded in clouds and darkness.

JESSE H. HOLMES.

"I do not pin my faith for the future to my country, or even to my race. I do not think it improbable that man, like the grub that prepares a chamber for the winged thing it never has seen, but is to be, may have cosmic destinies that he does not understand. And so, beyond the vision of battling races and an impoverished earth, I catch a dreaming glimpse of peace."
—*Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes.*

Notes from Seattle

Two things happened yesterday in Seattle, which while they may not (and may) be of historical significance, certainly show which way the wind is blowing in the political and economic world. (By the way, the people here can not be blamed for often referring to the ideal summer weather. They wonder why other folks, who suffer from the extreme heat in the East, do not fly over here for a change.)

The first thing that I mention is the "Dr. Townsend Mass-meeting" at the foot of Queen Anne hill, held in the Ball Park of the Civic Auditorium. Seattle has a quite accessible Civic Center, where one will find a ball park, an auditorium, a skating rink and so forth. One can find at this Center a ball game (now played at night, under electric lighting—shades of the fathers! how marvellous!) or a prize-fight or a Christian Science lecture or a Sportsman Show—sometimes all going on at once. Dr. Townsend's meeting was too big for the auditorium proper (holding 7,000)—it was therefore announced on the bill-boards that it would be held in the Ball Park, which has all-out-doors—at least enough of it to allow home-runs, and seats with bleachers sufficient to accommodate 40,000 or more. Such faith! But the faith of the bill-boards was justified.

I dropped into the meeting (slipped would be a better word) shortly after 8 o'clock. I could hear Dr. Townsend's voice a block or so before I arrived. I managed to secure a seat in the far-end of the bleachers. There were over 25,000 people there. They looked to be of the "common-folks"—this is meant for a compliment. Never have I been so reminded of the "crowds" that followed the Nazarene, back in the first century. They had come from the "hills round about" and up from the "cities." They looked like those who needed a leader and would make good "followers." Good average American men and women often in family groups. Clear over in the center of the Ball-field was a cluster of about a hundred people. There was a tiny platform and audiphone. In our day it is no longer a "coming out to see"—but a "coming out to hear." It would be impossible for me to describe Dr. Townsend—only to tell of his voice. I am reminded how frequently in the Scripture, the Eternal is referred to as the "Voice."

The people were invited to come to hear "what the Townsend Plan will do for National Recovery, employment of Youth and the Abolition of the present Relief System." The plan as is now generally known recommends the gift of $200 a month to people over sixty years of age. There is the provision that it be spent within the month. The argument is based on the contention that to increase the buying capacity of the public will result in the sudden recovery of the making of "goods" to buy. This is similar to the contention of Mr. Ford, that "hard times" is the time to increase wages—because of the consequent increase of buying capacity on the part of the public.

Dr. Townsend, with his modest wife, has been preaching this gospel for some time, and there is no reason to doubt the statement that some millions have joined the "Townsend Clubs." Like Sinclair he has multitudes following him and in some respects for similar reason—they feel that more money brought to the people will increase their purchasing power which will act as a kind of a priming of the pump, and start things going. In choosing that section of the American family where the people are sixty years old, or over, he has chosen with considerable common sense. The "old folks" have "earned it"—they are "in need of it"—they would have to be "supported" anyway—they would be "wise spenders."

As I sat there in the combined moon-light and glaring electric-light, reflecting, I couldn't help saying to myself, this is an honest voice and must be heard with respect. There may be behind it more power than I know. It does not seem to point to fundamental causes and remedies—but easily it might give relief to the public if this more buying capacity were placed in the hands of the folks over sixty. One can not ignore the belief that there is much common-sense in the contentions of Dr. Townsend and in his Plan. It would be a great spending by those of sober age, and not by those who would go on a spree. The Townsend Plan is at least to be watched.

The second thing I mention is the probable creation of a new daily newspaper in Seattle, to be called *Seattle Daily American.* If this is a go it will mark the advent of a very significant event for the Northwest and indeed for the whole country. I heard the announcement of it in a public meeting of Technocrats—who are numerous in Seattle. The plan is to find 30,000 people who will subscribe for such a paper in advance, by the payment of $1.30, which will cover a two months' subscription—$1.00 being returned if the paper is not a go. It is to be a six-day paper, without a Sunday issue. It is for organized Labor, Commonwealth Builders, for followers of Sinclair, Dr. Townsend, LaFollettes,—all forward looking progressive people.

It is planned that this paper shall compare favorably with other Seattle dailies—*The Times, Post-Intelligencer* (a Hearst paper) and the *Star.* It will adequately cover local and world news—as the other papers. It will be delivered at the door—as other papers. In other words, it will meet the needs of many thousands, to whom the present papers are unsatisfactory. It is announced that such a paper is needed in Seattle and will succeed, because "Seattle has many of the more educated liberal-thinking people and because Seattle has the most reactionary daily papers of any city in America."

At any rate, during the next two months there will be many hundreds and thousands in this part of the world agitating for such a daily paper. It must be remembered that Seattle had some fifteen years ago a very live daily paper, whose name for enterprise and activity was known throughout the land. It is remembered also that this paper failed. In spite of this failure it is believed that there is the same demand for a daily paper now as then, and the failure has brought its lesson. The paper will be independent and will stand for all progressive and liberal movements. It will defend all American ideals of liberty and equality. It will stand against Fascism, also for the complete abolition of

the obsolete profit system, and will work to substitute planning for economic chaos.

This enterprise is worth watching, and the *Seattle Daily American* is worth subscribing for as an experiment in journalism by those out of Seattle to see how it will work. Office at 90 University Street, Seattle. $1.30 for two months.

SYDNEY STRONG.

P. S. I can not forbear adding that next day I attended the meetings in the Church of the People, whose pastor is Fred W. Shorter. I notice that no one in the East followed my advice and invited him to come East this summer to preach for them. Better correct that during the coming year! It was an interesting time. You recall that Shorter's pulpit and chair are both painted red. He is quite the contrast in appearance. He preached a telling sermon on the Penalty of Seeing—taking the case of the youth who was blind, but had been made to see. The church authorities, the parents and even the blind boy got all mixed up over the simple event of the blind seeing. Even so now! He made an appeal to youth to insist on seeing, in spite of Scribes, Pharisees and parents.

Readers of UNITY would have enjoyed the hearty congregational singing of Lowell's

Once to every man and nation
Comes the moment to decide

and following Lowell's fine hymn came our John Haynes Holmes' equally fine hymn,

The voice of God is calling
Its summons unto men;
As once he spoke in Zion,
So now he speaks again.

And, I confess that I was stirred when a quartette led the congregation, to the tune of the "Anvil Chorus," my daughter, Anna Louise's hymn, "Over All the Lands," which has been just arranged for mass singing,

Over the prairies and over the mountains
And up from the cities that front the sea,
Out from the mills and the mines and the forests
Is surging the call that shall set men free.

CHORUS:

Over all the lands it sounds and over all the waters:
"Earth and the fruits of earth for all earth's sons and daughters.
No more each for each alone,
But undivided,
With hearts decided
We rise to claim our own!"

It was not surprising to see many of this group at the after-forum taking with them sheets of little stickers, to paste on their letters and receipts, in a fight against yellow journalism, the words, "I Don't Read Hearst."

S. S.

Notes on a Trip to the Orient

No. II

We were invited to what the Japanese call "Cha-no-yu" or "tea ceremony." None of us had had any instructions as to behavior in what turned out to be a most meticulous ritual, almost as solemn as a communion service. We did what our Japanese hosts told us to do but at that felt like clumsy barbarians being initiated into the infinite refinements of an aesthetic cult. The matted room was empty save for silk cushions set down in a circle for the guests. At one end of the room was the raised platform called the tokonoma where stood a vase containing three flowering branches. Behind it on the wall hung a scroll, called the kakemono. There is a severe simplicity in this typical room arrangement. At first it struck me as too bare for comfort but after a bit I could understand why the Japanese consider our homes cluttered and unaesthetic. We had left our shoes outdoors and sat Japanese fashion on the mats but our feet soon went to sleep and we had to change to Turkish fashion. I was amused to discover that westernized Japanese who live in Europeanized homes find it just as hard to sit on their feet as we do.

At the other end of the room a charming young girl was performing the ceremony of preparing the tea. Here was medieval Japan indeed. For the tea ceremony dates back nearly 500 years. Once a ruler of Japan resigned in favor of an eight year old son so that he might devote his entire time to its refinements. The homes of most well-to-do Japanese boast a "tea-house" built to certain requirements and cared for almost as devotedly as if it were a shrine. In these days of feverish living the leisureliness of tea ceremony is justified because the special tea used is said to contain a high percentage of both vitamins A and C and a larger percentage of C than is found in lemon, orange, tomato, etc.!

To be able to perform the tea ceremony one must undergo a long and arduous training, for there are prescribed rules for getting up and sitting down, for opening and closing sliding doors, for walking in with the tea things, or leaving the room carrying things. Other formalities apply to all the processes of making the tea. I watched with fascination the almond-eyed girl rinsing out the bowl in which the tea was to be made, measuring the powdered green tea and then pouring the hot water over it. The next process was to stir and beat the mixture with a whisk which looked exactly like a shaving brush. With a bamboo dipper the tea was then apportioned to bowls and other charming young girls brought them to where we were kneeling. Utter silence prevailed during all this. The young girl bowed as she set the bowl of tea before us. We bowed in acknowledgment. She bowed again and gracefully returned to the hostess. Our tea bowls must be picked up and held in both hands and the tea drunk rather quickly. It tasted like bitter medicine. All the better that it is polite to gulp! We found a sweetmeat on a piece of sandalwood at our places before the tea was served. It was a sizable square of chestnut paste which was very rich and very delicious. We did our best with the pocket edition of a chop stick which was provided but found that trying to maneuver a bit of the paste from the table to our mouths was worse than eating peas with a knife. I looked down the line to see how the Japanese were doing it. Much more sensibly! They picked up the bit of sandlewood and held it close to their mouths. The one chopstick served as a shovel. That I discovered was the whole secret of eating anything with chopsticks. If you leave your bowl on the table the distance becomes too perilous. But it is Japanese manners to hold your bowl in your hand and shovel.

Inasmuch as we didn't know the formalities of praising the handmade pottery or the flower arrangement, or of lingering politely, the ceremony was adjourned prematurely. We were then ushered into another room and at tables with waiters rushing about we were served an American tea. There were sandwiches and very sweet cakes and candies and the room was soon a hubbub of chatter. The contrast in spite of the relief of knowing what to do was, I thought, pretty much in favor of the Japanese. There must be something very peaceful and friendly about a tea ceremony where guests and host are familiar with the conventions, where neither food nor conversation are the primary attractions but where there is a mutual enjoyment of grace, of charm, of beautiful objects, of human character. Most practical Americans visiting Japan would not agree with me, I fancy. Many of my companions, especially the men, thought it a tiresome ceremony and begrudged the time it took. Some of the men made disparaging remarks about the young girls whom they did not find pretty. It was all I could do to keep my eyes off them. There is a sweetness and purity, a simplicity and poise, that made me want to know more about them. What goes on beneath that calm exterior? How do they reconcile this ceremonious training with a modern world? Perhaps the Japanese are clinging foolishly to an outworn custom. But my feeling is that it goes deeper than the vitamins in the green tea.

The model grammar school we visited early one morning reminded me of Vienna. It was of steel construction, extremely modern and full of windows. It lacked the usual Japanese roof with its pointed corners, as well as the fragility and quaintness to which I was becoming accustomed. The school system in Japan is much on the German order. The elementary school lasts for six years. After that there is a middle school which may be either classical, vocational or technical. A higher school prepares for the university and after the university there are other special schools. All children are required to attend the six years of elementary school. It is almost an hundred percent attendance, the highest in the world, although only about sixteen percent of the graduates of the elementary schools go on with their education. The number of girls dwindles in the upper schools and only a few attend university.

The rooms in this grammar school were big and airy and I noticed the impact of modern educational methods everywhere. The seats were movable although there were two children to a desk. The primary rooms where arithmetic was being taught was a laboratory of real weights and counters and of life size clocks for teaching time. Writing is taught with a paint brush. Elementary education must be much harder for the Japanese with those intricate characters to learn to recognize and to write. Some of the writing was pinned up on the wall. I asked what the characters on one paper said. The guide seemed a little embarrassed as she translated, "The five biggest countries in the world are Japan, Russia, United States, Great Britain and France."

The art room showed unmistakable signs of Cizek influence. The drawings were delightfully free and colorful. The curriculum corresponded roughly to our own although there were courses one could find only in Japan. The one that impressed me the most was a course in learning how to tie up presents. To the Japanese the giving of gifts is as important as taking baths. But there are formulas to be observed. The ribbon, and the decorations on the package are fully as important as what is on the inside. So little girls learn that a wedding present must have the symbols of a plum, a bamboo and a pine twig, signifying long life, prosperity and good luck, and that all presents must be tied up in red and white except in the case of death when black is used.

In the large crafts room children were at work doing clay modelling. Battleships and busts of heroes were by far the most popular subjects. At one end of the room other children were learning the art of tie-dyeing. In a department store I had seen the exquisite sashes which at first sight looked like hand smocking in intricate patterns. They are really the product of tie-dyeing—an art that I did not realize was Japanese.

A large picture of Beethoven decorated the music room where a group of little girls were singing European music in thin voices. They looked considerably bored by it and glad to be diverted by American visitors.

Social service has become a part of Tokyo's ambitious school program and free dental and medical service are furnished the children of the poor. In this school, which was in a very humble neighborhood, school lunches were supplied. But the pride of the school was a violet ray cabinet, a very large and elaborate affair in which we saw several skinny little specimens with sun glasses on taking treatment. A parent-teacher association does not go in for bridge parties and lectures on the fauna of South America but seriously undertakes to train parents in the way they should go.

Although more and more women are training to be school teachers in Japan the preference in jobs is still given the men. Even in this elementary school half of the teachers were men, and I was told that in the upper schools a woman has no chance.

As we were led through room after room, a gymnasium equipped with all the standard apparatus to which we are accustomed as well as with cases full of fencing apparatus, one vicious collection for boys and a less vicious one for girls, a terrific wind whistled and blew around the building. We emerged to see youngsters hardly able to keep their feet on the ground and as we drove back towards the hotel I asked our guide if this kind of a wind was what was known as a typhoon. "Well, only a baby one," she said a little patronizingly, but at that moment I remarked that the trees on either side of the boulevard we were traversing were completely mowed down. Shortly after that we passed a newspaper building with its front ripped off. "I guess it's a grown-up typhoon," said our guide looking a little anxious. We had not been in the hotel long before reports of the many disasters in Osaka and Kyoto were in print. A school house in Osaka had collapsed with some

600 children in it and nearly all had perished. Newsboys, who were quite ancient looking men in their short coats and black tights, ran down the streets with the extras, shaking a large dinner bell to gain attention. A few days later the papers were full of investigations into the construction of the ill-fated school house. Scandals in the contracts were coming to light. Was this America or Japan?

The invitation for luncheon read "The detached residence of Baron Iwasaki." I was curious to know what a "detached residence" might be. We were driven to palatial grounds beautifully landscaped in English fashion and were ushered into a European mansion—very stiffly and formally furnished in the best French manner. This apparently was the "detached residence." The luncheon had been cooked either by a French chef or a very good imitation of one and there was nothing Japanese about it unless one included the very delicious little lobsters. A detached residence, I discovered, is a house for entertainment purposes. Japanese houses are not equipped for entertaining large parties of foreigners and I think the Japanese do not often introduce strangers into the sanctum of their homes as we so casually do. So wealthy Japanese who hold government positions or are important in commercial life maintain a separate house, built European fashion in which they entertain the foreign "barbarian" in the manner to which he is accustomed. I expect it is a relief to many barbarians to be able to sit on chairs and eat their own food, but to others, as it was to me, I think it must be a keen disappointment not to taste a little more of Japanese life. One of the guests at our small table was a charming young married woman just back from three years of living in England. Strolling through the lovely grounds after luncheon I learned that it was not easy for the Japanese woman who tastes the freedom and equality of living abroad to readjust herself to the rigidity of life at home. And, said she, it is worse for the children. "They do not remember their life here and they do not fit anywhere. They are unhappy and wish they were back in England." The school situation especially troubled her for it seems that the regular private schools refuse to take "foreignized" children. "Foreignized children" have seen and heard too much. They find the ways of other nations more interesting than their own and they rebel against the discipline of a Japanese curriculum.

Recognizing that conversation could not flourish where none of the Americans could speak Japanese and few of the Japanese could sustain a conversation in English our hosts had thought up other means of entertainment. Out on the terrace that looked down on a wooded hill with a tiny waterfall tinkling somewhere in its recesses tables were covered with unfired pottery while two artists deftly painted designs on vases, plaques and other small articles. We were told to choose whatever piece we liked and to paint our names on the bottom. I chose a vase with a chrysanthemum in yellow and asked one of our Japanese hosts to print my name in Japanese characters down the side. The gifts were later fired and delivered to our home-going boat, a treasured memento of a "detached residence" party.

That evening our hosts were the staff of one of the largest newspapers in Tokyo. We were taken first through the beautifully modern building with its American presses. The noise and whir of machinery and the general confusion incident to getting out several editions of a daily newspaper were not unlike a large city newspaper at home with one exception. The local room was *not* noisy. Reporters were busy with their pencils but there were no typewriters. Because of the nature of the Japanese language and the number of characters typewriters are not practical. On top of the newspaper building one could see a good bit of Tokyo. The sun was just setting a rosy red when, like a sudden vision, gleamed the snowy top of Mount Fujiyama. It chanced that although we were taken later to a mountain pass famous for its views of this lovely peak that sunset view with the encircling dusk was the only time we saw it clearly. On the roof were tiers of cages where the homing pigeons were kept that serve Japanese newspapers on certain occasions better than telephoto or telegraph, especially when the transpacific boats dock.

There was among our hosts one woman, a quiet, shy person in a grey and black kimono, her hair brushed straight back from her forehead, her face showing a great deal more than the gentle sweetness of the average Japanese woman. She had been for forty years the woman's editor of the paper. I should like to know that woman's story. It must be a vivid history of the fearfully slow emergence of Japanese womanhood to some kind of equality with men.

I sat next to her at the sukiyaki party to which we were taken after the inspection of the newspaper building. The sukiyaki tea-house was in a narrow little street with Japanese lanterns alight and tinkling noises issuing forth from the shops and tea-houses lining it. It was like a stage setting, the first bit of Japan that looked as I had thought all Japan would look. A tiny garden was in front of the tea-house and inside the entrance we removed our shoes and were supplied with carpet slippers. Low lacquer tables filled the room and we knelt on silk cushions around them. I was fascinated by Miss Takenaka's lovely face. I wanted to know her better but the awful barrier of language kept us on the most superficial subjects. Sukiyaki is a dish not unknown these days in America but with canned substitutes it can probably never reach the gastronomic heights that it does in Japan. The first essential is that it be cooked over charcoal. A charcoal brazier glowed in the center of each table and each was ministered unto by a young girl in the kimono uniform of the tea-house. Beef and suet were the first ingredients and then followed soy sauce, and little piles of finely sliced vegetables, bamboo shoots, mushrooms, onions, bean shoots and many things I didn't recognize beside the little squares of bean cake. When the concoction is pronounced ready the guests take turns in lifting a portion with their chopsticks into their own little bowls and if you are a good Japanese you dip each mouthful into a raw egg before eating it. The little maid meanwhile replenishes the chafing dish with meat and vegetables from an inexhaustible supply and one eats and eats and eats.

An operetta by a company of Japanese girls was the entertainment for the evening. There is apparently no "co-education" in the Japanese theater. The companies are composed entirely of men actors or girl actors, the men taking women's parts in the former and the girls taking men's parts in the latter. The theater was comparatively new but much more like a European theater with its immense foyer and upstairs lobby than an American theater. The play commenced. We were amused by the tiny little figures in western clothes and the sweet feminine voices coming forth from masculine clothes when something familiar about the action awoke a faint memory. I glanced at the English program but there was no clue. As the play continued I was certain I had seen something a good deal like it before. The music gave it away. It was Noel Coward's "Bittersweet." We had seen it in London five years before. But as far as the Japanese were concerned Noel Coward was not in on the secret.

Out in the lobby where everyone repaired between acts were counters of trinkets and sweets for sale—a clever imitation of Peter's chocolate wrapped exactly like the original. The Hatmaker's Association had an exhibit to frighten Japanese into wearing headgear. If there are first nights when people in Tokyo come in full dress to the theater this was not one of them. One walked about for exercise rather than to look at the pretty clothes.

DOROTHY WALTON BINDER.

"What Christians Should Remember and Jews Forget"*

Is it not for fair-minded Christians to be prepared to say, as do we of the Synagogue, that Christianity did not come to earth full-grown, without background, motivations or history, and that the background, motivations and history of Christianity are completely Jewish and solely Jewish. It has truly been said that Jesus is as inexplicable divorced from the Judean background of the first century of this era as Abraham Lincoln is inexplicable save in the light of the pioneering days of the first decades of the nineteenth century. Greatness may transcend its background but it does not conceal or obliterate it. A score of proofs can be adduced which make clear beyond peradventure that Jesus was primarily and essentially a Jew and a Jewish teacher of the first century, who cannot be understood save in the terms of Jewish teaching and of synagogue background. Nothing could be farther from the truth, nothing could be a grosser travesty of the truth, no fouler libel against Jesus could be devised, than the recent word of the so-called Reichsbishop of the Nazi church that Jesus was the first of the anti-Semites. One might just as validly urge that Abraham Lincoln was anti-Anglosaxon or George Washington anti-American.

What Christians should remember is that nowhere is there to be found the faintest scintilla of evidence that Jesus sought either to separate himself from his Jewish brothers, or to take himself out of and away from the Jewish people of which he was a part, or that he aimed to create a church or ecclesiastical organization which was to supersede the synagogue wherein as a Jewish child he had been reared. If at times Jesus spoke in grave rebuke to those among his brothers, who seemed to be wanting in the vision or the will to obey the word of God, it must be admitted that he was no harsher nor severer than have been the prophets of every age who, without forsaking or deserting their people, have almost uniformly employed terms of bitterest reproach against them. Jesus was no more unJewish when he scourged a handful of money-changers out of the Holy of Holies than President Roosevelt was anti-American when in his inaugural address he too spoke in lashing terms against the money-changers of a day nineteen centuries after Jesus. Reverting for a moment to the background and the viewpoint of Jesus, Christians may not forget, if they would be just, that the totality of the influences from which Jesus derived, and the major part of the spirit which went out from him to men, were Jewish and that he was most Jewish when he recognized and proclaimed and witnessed to the presence of God; when he, intoxicated with the God-consciousness, half-prayed and half-insisted that he and his Father were one.

Christians should remember that if Christianity means peace on earth and goodwill to men, such realm of peace must include the Jew, and that peace on earth and goodwill to men are nothing more than a mockery as long as Christendom remains unbrotherly to the Jew, whose very faults and intolerable shortcomings, as the non-Jew sees them, have been bred and fostered and magnified by Christendom's unbrotherliness to the Jew. And let Christendom remember in this year of gravest crisis, economic, political, spiritual, that peace on earth means nothing less than the peace which derives from true and complete justice between man and man and that there is and can be no good will in a world of enslavement and misery and degradation for the sons of men.

And if the Christian must remember, the Jew dare not forget that Christianity is the contribution of a Jew to the world's treasure-store at its highest. The Jew must forget what he has endured throughout too many and grievous Christless centuries and he must forgive as he has a genius for forgiving them that have wronged him. The wrongs that he has endured and the injustices which he has suffered are not Christian, but the denial and the repudiation of all that has the right to call itself by that name. The Jew would sin if he forgot that in this crisis of the world's history, in the presence of perhaps the mightiest insurrection of paganism, and of barbarism which the world has witnessed in a thousand years, the only redeeming hope of the world can be that Israel and Christendom stand together in united resistance to the enslaving forces of that barbaric paganism which would reinstate the godlets of passion and of lust and substitute them for the God of justice and of truth and of love whom Christian and Jew together worship.

And the Christian ought to understand and the Jew dare not fail to remember that even the rise or birth of Christianity did not exhaust the spiritual genius of the Jew and that from such unexhausted spiritual genius there may again derive a newest testament on behalf of those truths of brotherliness and justice and understanding and peace of which the world is in need at this hour. Let Christendom remember that it owes the Jew nothing less than the practice of Christianity. Let the Jew not forget the high vocation of his people

*Excerpt from sermon preached before the Free Synagogue at Carnegie Hall, New York.

throughout a mighty past and his supreme obligation to put away every unworthiness that he may once again become not the heir but the bringer of a newer and truer and juster message for men than men have ever known before.

STEPHEN S. WISE.

Two Eminent Living Americans

I

It has been a matter of great pleasure for me, an Indian but a naturalized American, to see that the distinguished editor of the *Modern Review* has done a great service to the people of India by publishing a series of articles on Eminent Americans by the Rev. Dr. J. T. Sunderland. As the series of articles has been published in book-form, it will have its permanent value, in promoting better understanding between the United States of America and India. It will dispel some of the misconceptions spread by some Indians and others who have given the dark side of American life a great deal of publicity in India, thus probably unconsciously having done a distinct disservice to the cause of Indo-American friendship and co-operation.

In this connection I wish to add a few words on the subject of the fundamentals upon which the great republic of the United States has been founded and flourished. It is based upon the ideals of freedom, justice and peace. I do not mean to say that the people or the government of the United States have never committed anything which may be termed as against the cause of human freedom, which is unjust and which is not peaceful, but on the whole the ideals of freedom, justice and peace have predominated in their activities.

Furthermore I wish to emphasize the point that no country in the world has done so much in aiding Indian students, as the most enlightened section of the American people—especially the American educators and educational institutions—have done. I have the experience of some thirty years living in various countries in Asia, Europe and America; and I may say that at least more than five hundred Indians have been able to secure higher education from the United States, only because they were helped wholly or partially by Americans. To be sure there are many people in the United States who are anti-Asiatic, but since the time of Swami Vivekananda's visit to the United States and up to the present time, many eminent Americans have helped Indians and Indian social, religious and educational activities with greater generosity than any other foreign people in the world. The Ram Krishna Mission movement at its very inception received financial and moral support of some generous Americans and the late Mrs. Ole Bull was one of the first ones to help Swami Vivekananda. The late Dharmapala received considerable support financially and morally from various Americans. Dr. Rabindranath Tagore's Viswa Bharati has been helped by many Americans.

May I say that hundreds of American families of middle class and high culture, without any motive of gain or profit, have befriended poor Indian students who sought higher education in the United States. Today there are a few Indians in the United States who have not only received higher education through the generosity of the American people but are given the opportunity to teach in American institutions of learning. Let me be specific—I owe all of my higher education to the people of the United States and I am grateful to them. Dr. Sudhindra Bose who is connected with the Department of Political Science in the University of Iowa owes his higher education and present position to the kindness and consideration of broadminded Americans. Dr. Chatterjee of the Department of History in Antioch College owes his education and position to the good will of some eminent Americans. Prof. Joshi of Dartmouth College owes his present position as well as his higher education through the generosity of Americans. Mr. Syed Hussain who is doing some lecture work in the United States owes much to American generosity. Mr. Dhan Gopal Mukerji who has made a name for himself as a poet, lecturer and author owes his success solely to the help he received from Americans. Dr. R. K. Das who is now connected with the International Labor Office of the League of Nations is a product of American education and he is undoubtedly the best authority on Indian labor and industrial problems. Dr. Saklatwala, who is now the Vice-President of Vanadium Corporation is a product of American education. Mr. P. C. Mukherjee of Pittsburgh who holds a very responsible position as a chemist in the Carnegie Steel Corporation and has been in Russia as an expert has received his education through the co-operation of American friends and holds his present position through American good will. Dr. A. M. Gurjar of New York has made a success as a chemist and he received his higher education in America. The same thing is true of Dr. Kokotnur and others.

There are many others in India who not only received their education through the kindness of Americans, but they are today filling important and responsible positions with great efficiency. Dr. Biraj Guha was helped by the authorities of Harvard University and was given the opportunity to teach and today as an anthropologist he is an asset to India. Mr. Suren Bose of Tata and Company not only received his higher education as an electric engineer, in America, but he acquired most valuable practical training with J. G. White and Company. Mr. Mathur who is now with the Tata Steel corporation received his education in America and had his practical training in the Ford Motor Car Company. There are many Indian educators and industrialists such as Mr. Suremndra Mohon Bose of Bengal Waterproof Works, Mr. K. C. Das of Calcutta Chemical Works, Biren Das Gupta of Indo-Swiss Trading Company, Prof. Baneswar Das of College of Engineering and Technology at Jadavpur, Mr. Sarangadhor Das and Mr. V. P. Iyg, both sugar chemists, and many others are products of American education and training. They all owe a debt of gratitude to many Americans. India owes the United States of America a great deal, because the latter has helped India to increase her national efficiency.

May I suggest that those Indians and Americans who are interested in promoting Indo-American cultural cooperation should take stock of India's indebtedness to the United States in various fields. This will help in laying the solid foundation of Indo-American cultural co-operation. Dr. Rabindranath Tagore, Sir Radha Krishnan, Sir C. V. Raman, Prof. Surendranath Das Gupta, Prof. Benoy Kumar Sarkar, Prof. Kali Das Nag, Prof. Wadia, and many other Indian scholars

and politicians—such as the late Lala Lajpat Rai, the late V. J. Patel, Mrs. Naidu and others—have enjoyed very generous hospitality from the people of the United States and they should take the initiative in taking effective steps for promoting Indo-American friendship.

II

Among the American publicists, educators, politicians, literally hundreds of them have championed the cause of Indian Freedom and it is not my intention to write about them, but I wish to mention that two eminent Americans—Rev. Dr. J. T. Sunderland and Rev. Dr. John Haynes Holmes—have served the people of India most effectively by championing the cause of Indian freedom and interpreting Indian ideals to the American people. The well known services of Dr. Sunderland need not be discussed at length. But I must say that during the last fifty years Dr. Sunderland has been doing his best to spread truth about India. It may be mentioned that even the late Dadabhai Naoroji and Sir William Digby owed much to Dr. Sunderland, because the latter was possibly the originator of the theory that the famine in India was not due to want of food in India but due to poverty of the people caused by foreign exploitation. Dadabhai Naoroji, Ramesh Chandra Dutt, Sir William Digby, Kier Hardy and others developed this theory expounded by Dr. Sunderland. In the field of Comparative Religion, Dr. Sunderland has done signal service to India by interpreting Indian religions as well as philosophy. Dr. Sunderland has spent his time and money unceasingly to serve the people of India, because he felt that by doing so he was serving the cause of humanity. His work "India in Bondage and Her Right To Freedom" remains today the best work on India.

The people of India in general do not know much of Dr. John Haynes Holmes, the pastor of the Community Church of New York. He is a great student of Comparative Religion and is the greatest of the active religious leaders of America, noted for his liberalism and appreciation of all religious faiths. He is possibly the greatest and the most fearless advocate of Peace. During the World War he opposed America's entry and opposed War in any form in the most vigorous manner. When anti-Germanism was the prevailing thought in America, Dr. Holmes welcomed the Germans as human beings to share with him and his church-members the spirit of human fellowship. He has championed every progressive cause in the United States and upheld every movement for human freedom —Indian freedom, Philippine Independence, etc.

It is not generally known to the Indian public that Dr. Holmes was one of the first Christian pastors, who gave full recognition to the intrinsic value of the Non-Violent Non-Co-operation Movement sponsored by Mahatma Gandhi. In a historic sermon delivered in the Community Church of New York Dr. Holmes several years ago *proclaimed Gandhi as "the greatest man in the world today."* Since that day, he has used his efforts, through his writings and lectures, to make known the activities of Mahatma Gandhi and the All India National Congress unceasingly. In his paper, UNITY, during the recent years, more has been published about India than any other paper in a foreign land.

As a public speaker Dr. Holmes is unquestionably one of the foremost in the English-speaking world; and he has used his eloquence to rouse the people of America to further the cause of justice, liberty and peace. He was one of the leaders of the movement that the ill-fated Sacco and Vanzetti should be given justice. He is now agitating that Tom Mooney who is in prison due to perjured evidence, should be freed. He is advocating that the *"Scottsborough Negro prisoners"* should be freed. He believes and preaches that all the Indian political prisoners in India, Germany or Soviet Russia, who are placed in jails or concentration camps without trial, should be freed. He, like the founders of the America Republic, believes that the cause of justice and human liberty should be fought all over the world.

Dr. Holmes is a truly religious man, a man of peace. War and violence are opposed to his conception of religion. For this reason he advocates disarmament and arbitration among nations. He does not hesitate to criticize his own government, when he thinks that it is following a wrong policy, endangering the peace of the world. He is one of the foremost exponents of the idea that Christianity and War cannot be reconciled. He was one of the first Christian leaders to advocate that Christian pastors should take the leadership in refusing to support any war, and furthered the recent historic meeting of Christian Ministers (held on May 2, 1935) at the Riverside Church (popularly known as the Rockefeller Church) at New York in which more than two hundred Christian ministers took the following solemn oath:—

> In loyalty to God I believe that the way of true religion cannot be reconciled with the way of war. In loyalty to my country I support its adoption of the Kellogg-Briand Pact which renounces war. In the spirit of true patriotism and with deep personal conviction, I therefore renounce war and never will I support another.

Dr. Holmes has raised his powerful voice against race-hatred, religious bigotry and political and economic imperialism. He is always for the under-dog; but he is not one who believes in the mechanistic theory of life. He lays special emphasis on the value of idealism and spiritual significance of life, which he so admirably discussed in one of his recent sermons on "Life, Death and Immortality" delivered on the last Easter Sunday. Like Dr. Sunderland, Dr. Holmes was once a Unitarian minister; but he does not believe in any special creed and sect and is truly a universalist. The following statement which is accepted by him as a declaration of faith, gives some idea of his creed:—

> Unto the Church Universal, which is the depository of all ancient wisdom and the school of all modern thought; which recognizes in all prophets a harmony, in all scriptures a unity, and through all dispensations a continuity; which abjures all that separates and divides, and always magnifies brotherhood and peace; which seeks truth in freedom, justice in love and individual discipline in social duty; and which shall make of all sects, classes, nations and races, one fellowship of men—unto this Church and unto all its members, known and unknown, throughout the world, we pledge the allegiance of our hands and hearts.

In the Rev. J. J. Sunderland and Rev. John Haynes Holmes one finds the finest types of eminent Americans and true followers of the founder of the Christian faith. Dr. Sunderland is ninety-five years of age and still vigorous and busy with his literary activities in serving humanity. Dr. Holmes is barely fifty-five years old and as a champion of human freedom, religious liberty and opponent of racial prejudice is never too tired to extend a helping hand to all seeking his co-operation. America is not a land of mere "dollar-chasers." There are many idealists in this country. If India should be proud of her Tagore and Gandhi, then the United States can justly be proud of her Sunderland and Holmes.

TARAKNATH DAS.

Washington and Free Trade

A Note on History

We have in recent years been in the worst wrangle over high tariffs which we have ever known. Europe is convulsed from one end to the other over tariff issues. The new states set up by the Versailles treaty multiplied new boundaries, and most unhappily these have become commercial barriers with new tariffs as their presumed chief defense. The mischief of this in the agricultural Danubian states has become so devastating that the central and western European nations cut down their tariffs affecting those nations in signal measure. M. Briand, the greatest of recent European statesmen and the most internationally minded among them, was keenly alive to this mischief of tariffs and commercial barriers between the European states; and his dominant interest in his last years was the creation of a United States of Europe, between which states tariffs should be abolished. One of his strongest appeals, as with other European leaders in the same policy, was to the example of the United States of America. He was quite aware that the analogy was not exact; but in its central principle and purpose the argument was germane and commanding.

There was nothing more mischievous or more provocative of quarrels among our states in the critical period between the Revolution and the adoption of the Constitution than the tariffs between the states. A man could not take a load of wood or basket of eggs from Connecticut into New York without paying a duty. In two or three cases there was rupture and danger of open war. Our wise fathers in the Constitutional Convention in 1787 put an end to this at one stroke; and the prime source of our prosperity from that time to this has been the fact that as between the states, over an area as vast and varied as all Europe outside of Russia, this is a free-trade federation. It works hardships of some sort to almost every state. Massachusetts wheat-growers cannot compete with Dakota, and many states cannot compete with the cotton-factories and shoe-shops of Massachusetts; but for the federation altogether it is an immense benefit. It would be a benefit for the federation of the world, whose constituent nations are now rapidly becoming as closely related and as interdependent as our states when Washington and his great associates put interstate free-trade into our national Constitution.

It is profitable at such a time to turn back to Washington's own words. He wrote with peculiar clearness and impressiveness in a letter to the Marquis de Chastellux, one of the Frenchmen who had helped us in the Revolution, written from Mount Vernon, September 5, 1785:

> My first wish, he said, is to see the blessings of peace diffused through all countries, and among all ranks in every country, and that we consider ourselves the children of a common parent, and so disposed to acts of brotherly kindness towards one another. In that case, all restrictions of trade would vanish; we should take your wines, your fruits and surplusage of other articles, and give you in return our oils, our fish, tobacco, naval stores, etc.; and in like manner we should exchange produce with other countries, to our reciprocal advantage. The globe is large enough. Why then need we wrangle for a small spot of it? If one country cannot contain us, another should open its arms to us.

This word was written at the very hour when the Father of the Country was passing from being our First in War to become our First in Peace. Richard Cobden, who was not born until twenty years after 1785, could not have written a better free-trade letter than that; and perhaps the most significant thing in it is the direct relation which Washington emphasizes between "restrictions of trade" and the unfriendliness and recriminations between nations which tend to provoke hostility and war. There is nothing at this moment which provokes more ill feeling towards ourselves in Europe than our high tariff; and it is, we will not say in retaliation for this, but in self-defense, that Great Britain felt herself compelled to change her whole policy on the tariff question.

As concerns Washington on free-trade and its relation to world peace, the obvious retort to be expected from our champions of protection and high tariffs is that while Washington may have talked free-trade in an emotional outburst to the Marquis de Chastellux, in 1785, when it came to responsible action as president of the United States in 1789, he made Alexander Hamilton his Secretary of the Treasury, and supported him in his fiscal and economic measures; and Hamilton was "the father of our American protective policy."

The proposition rests upon a superficial understanding of Washington's administration and Hamilton's "protective policy," which policy had little more to do with the principles of, for example, our present tariff and the popular argument for it than we have to do with the man in the moon. The men who make this careless appeal to Hamilton's "protective policy" would do well to look up the tariff schedules which Hamilton sanctioned and compare them with the schedules of our tariff bill. The effort to make Hamilton responsible for these or for the current arguments in their behalf would make Hamilton turn in his grave. Hamilton's policy on this subject was expounded in his Report on Manufactures in 1791, and any student desiring an accurate knowledge of his argument will find it there.

EDWIN D. MEAD.

Calling*

Labor shall live, and thought be free,
As men have dreamed of old;
And every man his gift shall give,
And no one shall withhold;
In the glad day that is to be,
That calls and calls for you and me.

The day may wait, and hopes may fail,
And times grow worse and worse;
The martyr mourn again the fate
That lays on him the curse,
But, none the less, the day to be
Calls and yet calls to you and me.

They live who hear, who offer all
To bring the dream to pass;
Who neither covet more, nor fear
What price the present has;
So that we build the world to be
That calls and calls to you and me.

ROBERT WHITAKER.

*A hymn for Labor Day.—Editor.

The Study Table

A New Plea for Liberty

Nothing can ever supersede John Stuart Mill's essay "On Liberty," which is one of the supreme classics of English literature. But this immortal work was necessarily couched in the language of Victorian England, as Shakespeare's plays, for example, were couched in the language of Elizabethan England. It is essentially a product, in other words, of the nineteenth century, when liberalism was to the fore and dominant. But now the twentieth century has come, and its predecessor seems as ancient as the Middle Ages. A cataclysm has engulfed our world, and brought changes unimagined a generation ago. Institutions which we had thought firmly established are shaken; ideas which had become sacred are now challenged or denounced; democracy, the perfect product of modern times, is apparently battling for its very life. Liberty, if it is to be passed on to our children as we received it from our fathers, has got to be fought for against enemies which threaten to destroy us as the barbarians destroyed Rome.

It is Dr. Joad's great service in this brilliant book* of his, that he comes to the rescue of liberty in this our desperate day. To say that his essay is worthy to take its place beside that of Mill is to give it great but not undeserved praise. His argument, of course, borrows extensively from Mill, as the author himself is careful to point out. Mill's argument was so complete that it cannot be supplemented, and so perfectly expressed that it can be rephrased only with a definite loss of clarity and color. But Joad's book is not only valuable but indispensable in setting Mill's essay in the atmosphere of our time, and thus considering the theme of liberty in the light of what has happened and is happening all about us.

Dr. Joad's great contribution to our thought and life in his beautifully written pages is not in his restatement of the case for liberty, but rather in his survey of the case as it stands under vigorous assault at this moment. Of unique importance are his two chapters on the case against liberty and the alternatives to liberty. Here, of course, the Communists and Fascists loom large, especially the latter. For the author insists upon making distinction between what is going on in Russia and what is going on in Italy and Germany, although he agrees that liberty is for the present at least quite as effectually extinguished by the Reds as by the Blacks and Browns. But the foes of liberty *par excellence* are the Fascists and the Nazis, and it is the preaching and practice of these two movements which the author considers at length. That he makes their arguments as ridiculous as their institutions are horrible, goes without saying. As an attack upon the enemies of liberty, these pages are devastating. The case for liberty stands, today as yesterday—unless, forsooth, we really desire to return to the Dark Ages, or beyond to the earlier days of primitive savagery. Liberty is coincident with democracy, and democracy with civilization. It is liberty, therefore, which we must preserve at any cost if our world is not to disappear like an eclipse of nature.

Dr. Joad has written an able and important book—also, a most timely one. There are all too many people today, especially young people, who would lightly throw away their heritage of freedom, bought at so great a price of suffering and death, for some quick achievement of social change which they think essential to the happiness of men. Can they not see that liberty is itself essential to happiness, and that without liberty no reform or revolution is worth the having? What air is to the lungs, that liberty is to the mind and heart. When we have liberty, as air, we enjoy it without thinking; when we lose liberty, we suddenly strangle and struggle for it as the condition of life itself. We wish this book might be read and pondered by all who think any type of force and violence, repression and tyranny, the easy way to progress.

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES.

*"Liberty Today," by C. E. M. Joad. Published by Dutton & Co., New York. $2.50.

Unfinished Symphony

Not from the ringing blows of Charlemagne's battle-axe on the doomed Avars by the Don, nor yet from the hoof-beats of Caesar's cavalry as it thundered down the slopes at Pharsalus, the latest Appleton production† (at baton of Ralph Bates) takes overture—instead, the lyric strains of Music's unfinished symphony float faintly over the footlights as Franz Schubert takes the stage his little hour: living a life as gloriously miserable as Keats or Shelley, dying as tragic a death, but (like them) bequeathing as legacy to the world a golden estate of immortal melody. Some brief pen-sketch of this heart-rending drama comes in appropriately: and is therefore in order.

The curtain rises on Vienna of Metternich, with Demos crushed beneath his mailed dictatorship, but with Orpheus and Venus at apogee: and, under Mr. Bates' skilful direction, this aery spectacle swings in ironic swiftness on its way: Schubert's repressed childhood; his fantastic education, interpolated by Napoleonic salvoes; his first compositions, in the field of song and mass; early love-strains, forever thwarted, with a compensatory outpouring in song; a subsequent escape from teaching tyranny into a musical life and a circle of friends; slow mastery of materials; "Erlking," "The Twins," "The Wanderer," tuneful rhapsodism intermingled with Platonic enthusiasms and Viennese night-life; a medical interlude, confining our hero to single estate for life; a musical interlude, reviewing Schubert's work synthetically: *"Gretchen am Spinnenrade,"* "Mignon's Song," "Memnon," "Tartarus," "Ganymede," plus that precious kaleidoscope of joy and grief, "Unfinished Symphony"—all these, and the death of the delightful little protagonist, worn down by neglect, starvation, and disease, begging with final breath to be joined to that high god of his adoration, the divine Beethoven, beside whom his spirit immediately and ever after took throne, in that eternal palace of genius which mortals call Immortality.

This periodic outline, while, in the main, it comprises the principal events of Schubert's life as Mr. Bates has recreated them, is, however, pathetically inadequate to portray the maestro's achievements, or the alert skilful manner in which the dramatist makes them live. No musician ourselves, we make no pretense to discussing such matters, neither will the reader be much further detained. In closing it need only be added that another first-magnitude star has arisen in the Appleton galaxy: and, so saying, we take final leave of its subject, Franz Schubert: small, compact, energetic, erotic, devil-ridden by divinest dreams, his insignificant frame the battle-ground for the most extraordinary of all combats between reality and fancy, whose reverberations, as they reach our ears in the grandeur and loveliness of his music, seem to at once justify and negative the loftiest earthly efforts.

ROBERT C. SCHALLER.

†Franz Schubert. By Ralph Bates. Appleton, 1935. $1.50.

Correspondence

Dictatorship Evils Greater Than Those of Democracy

Editor of UNITY:

America was lately held up as an awful warning of the failure of democracy. In a debate in the British Parliament over India, the Bishop of Exeter opposed allowing India any larger measure of self-government, on the ground that the Indians might fall under the influence of "some great machine," like the Republican and Democratic machines in the United States. He had made a short visit to this country, and had been shocked by what he saw.

There are dangers in democracy, but the dangers of absolutism are worse. The government of India is really a British dictatorship. Under a law of long standing, the government can put anyone in prison without trial, and keep him there indefinitely.

Sir John Anderson, former leader of the "Black and Tans" in Ireland, is Governor of Bengal. According to the India Bulletin, published in London, he has been holding 2,509 young Bengalese in prison for the last six years without trial and under such conditions that many of them have committed suicide. An effort was lately made to raise money for their wives and children, who are left without their bread-winners. The newspapers were forbidden to publish the appeal, or to make any mention of the matter. Many other cruelties and injustices are attributed to Sir John Anderson, including the laying of heavy fines upon whole districts for the offenses of individuals. In all his proceedings he has had the full support of the government in London.

There are faults in our American democracy, but the evils of dictatorship are still greater.

ALICE STONE BLACKWELL.

In Berlin

Editor of UNITY:

It was a happy day in the apartment of the Familie Schulz in their modest home in a modest quarter of Berlin. Mütterchen had come home. The very walls seemed to radiate satisfaction.

Five long, sad years she had been away, but the great doctors at the asylum had always been hopeful. "Some day she will take a turn for the better and when she once begins to recover the re-establishment of her sanity is likely to be relatively rapid," they had said.

And so it had been. She was at home again and there was every reason to hope that the old disturbing illusions were gone for good.

So much the more distressing was the change of mood that made itself felt before long. At first all had seemed to go well but after some two weeks she began to show signs of being disturbed, frightened.

Her husband begged her to keep nothing to herself, to trust him with all her thoughts. "Were the children unsatisfactory in any way? Did she not sleep well? Could anything be done to make her room pleasanter? Of course, such a change, after five years, meant lots of readjustment. One understood that. The order, regularity, quiet of the—"

"No, no," she broke in. She could not begin to say how happy she was to be at home. "But, oh Heinrich, I am so afraid some mental trouble is beginning again and that I shall have to go back. They were good to me, but I cannot tell you how I dread the idea. It is not that I don't sleep well. It is when I am awake that I have the strangest ideas. I cannot rid myself of them. I do not read the papers much as you know, but even from them these mad impressions come to me as if I had read them, and others come as if people had really told them to me.

"People seem afraid. They put their fingers on their lips. In the restaurant the other night I noticed many groups sitting with their heads together and looking over their shoulders as if they were afraid of being overheard. Are they insane or am I?

"And then such strange things! I thought I had seen in one of the illustrated papers an *auto da fés* of books here in Berlin, people burning up books in public. It wasn't the middle ages. The people were all in modern dress.

"And then the queerest ideas about Jews. All kinds of strange imaginations about them, unbelievable. How can my mind be sick enough to invent things like that? Horrors, sterilizing and things I don't like to talk about.

"And then a story about a house-painter or a paper-hanger or something, an Austrian or a Czech—I don't know exactly—that he was chosen a sort of emperor for life."

She laid her head on her hands. Heinrich looked at her speechless. How was he to make her understand that what she took for the nightmares of insanity were part, though not the ugliest part, of the absurd and tragic reality of the Germany to which she had returned?

EMILY G. BALCH.

Geneva, Switzerland.

Will America Remain Out of War?

Editor of UNITY:

A momentous problem faces America. Europe, Africa and Asia are about to be embroiled in war. War between Italy and Ethiopia is no longer a possibility but a probability. This probability has already caused a rift between England and France. On the other side of the world Japan is baring her ugly fangs. In her attempt to satisfy her gluttonous appetite war between Japan and Russia seems almost unavoidable. Furthermore, Vienna reports that she is about to place Archduke Otto upon the Austrian throne and the Little Entente is consequently alarmed.

The League of Nations, the Kellogg Pact, the Arms Conferences all seem helpless and sterile in the face of the tremendous catastrophe about to engulf the world.

The last war meant misery and suffering. We know that the coming war will be worse because of the advance in the technological means of extermination. The question facing America is: Will we be embroiled, sucked into the cauldron of death? We have not the power to stop the human extermination beyond the seas; but by forethought we have the means to forestall it from invading our shores.

At present we may not be interested in the disputes of the participants. But will this disinterest remain after we send munitions and supplies and money to help them carry on the war? The experience of the last war has taught us the power of propaganda and the facility of finding moral pretexts to bolster monetary interests. We realize that if Americans have sufficient material stakes involved, it is only a matter of time that we will be involved.

The solution, therefore, is for us to prevent our

nationals from obtaining stakes in the success of any belligerent. If America is not to be embroiled into a war, our Congress, during peace times, should pass a law prohibiting the sale of munitions, supplies and the loan of money to any nation at war with another. True, this will be temporarily penalizing our own people by preventing trade; but in the long run will be a boon to our peace, prosperity and welfare.

The United States is the most self-sufficient nation upon the Earth. Practically all natural resources and manufactured goods needed for our consumption can be found within our territorial limits. Furthermore, over ninety percent of our trade is concentrated within our borders. It we wish to extend our trade and industry, we have almost unlimited opportunities on United States soil. Great sections of our country need electrification and housing. It has been estimated that in 1929, at the height of our prosperity, over sixty percent of our population were living below the minimum standard of living.

In time of foreign wars let us concentrate on advancing our standard of living and thus expanding for the welfare of our own country.

Another war, involving Europe and Asia, with all the modern means of extermination and destruction will probably mean the end of civilization. If America seriously desires it and uses forethought in forestalling our participation, offers no special interest the pretext to try to embroil us, she can become the outpost of a new civilization, the great survivor of a mad world.

MYRON W. JACOBS.

Militarism in Education*

EDITOR OF UNITY:

Bills to prohibit compulsory military training in civil schools and colleges were recently introduced concurrently in both Houses of Congress by Senator Gerald P. Nye and Congressman Paul J. Kvale (S. 3309 and H. R. 8950). This is the logical consequence of last December's Supreme Court decision which ruled adversely upon the petition of two student conscientious objectors to compulsory R. O. T. C. but which stated that Congress has the power to pass laws providing exemption from military training. Although such legislation is not expected to come up for action before next winter, the introduction of these bills marks another step in the protracted struggle to secure freedom of conscience from military domination in 118 civil colleges and schools where the R. O. T. C., furnished with Federal funds, is now compulsory.

In a year when military appropriations reached high tide it is worth pointing out that some important victories for peace have been won in the educational field. Over a period of the last twelve months we note the following:

1. The University of Minnesota abolished *compulsory* military training, the second "land grant" institution in the country to do so.

2. DePauw University in Indiana began the year with the abolition of all military drill.

3. New York University (College of Arts and Sciences) announced the abolition of *compulsory* military training to begin in the fall of 1935.

4. The University of New Hampshire set a precedent in exempting six students from military training on grounds of conscientious objecton.

5. Similar action was taken by Michigan State College for one student.

6. Bill H. R. 5593, initiated last February by the War Department to add two months to the enlistment period of the Civilian Conservation Corps "for the purpose of intensive military training" has been thus far blocked.

But at this juncture when the War Department has been given an extra million dollars to subsidize the extension of the R. O. T. C. to one hundred or more new institutions, the Committee on Militarism in Education is faced with the most serious financial crisis in its history. To continue its work, oppose new R. O. T. C. units and prepare a campaign for support of the Nye-Kvale amendment, it must have $5,000 before December 31. Financial contributions, large and small, are urgently needed now and should be sent to the Committee's office at 2929 Broadway, New York City.

GEORGE A. COE
JOHN NEVIN SAYRE
NORMAN THOMAS
OSWALD GARRISON VILLARD

For the Committee on Militarism in Education.
New York City.

*See article in "The Field" in this issue—EDITOR.

Killing Men to Get Trade

To the Editor:

Nathaniel Peffer in the June *Harper's* presents a cold-blooded proposal that the United States should make an alliance with Great Britain and that both should unite their navies in forcing Japan to cease her present aggression in China. This would be no "entangling alliance," but "if we are to play the game of high politics, we must play it to win." "We entered on a policy of condemnation of Japan's aggression. Now we must abandon that or act so as to accomplish our ends. If Japan succeeds, western powers will remain only on her suffrance." We must diminish our trade, (our exports in normal times being worth $200,000,000 though much diminished now) and we should lose opportunity for additional trade. "That is the stake in the Far East and the loss of it is the price we must pay." "Great Britain, being much more heavily involved financially would lose far more."

Mr. Peffer inveighs against "the gaucherie and blundering of our financiers and industrialists after the war who did not know what the world was about." Now Europe confidently expects that the United States will intervene with or without an ally. Yet unless we have the assistance of some other power, we can not protect our interests. The sole consideration seems to be our trade, our interests, our advantage. One would think that our government which signed the Paris Pact and solemnly pledged itself to "seek only pacific means of settlement no matter what the nature or the cause of a dispute" would not degrade itself to fight merely for money. The issue in the east of course has nothing to do with self-defense which was the one exception recognized in the acceptance of the Paris Pact.

Should we engage alone in a naval conflict on the other side of the Pacific so far from our base of suppies, it has been officially declared that it would cost us forty thousand million dollars. It would have to be fought by conscripts as there would be few volunteers. Mr. Peffer does not mention economic pressure or any peaceful substitute for explosives and poison gas, such as might come were we to join the League of Nations

and bring world condemnation upon Japan. He seems to take it as a matter of course that we have a right to engage in slaughter of our own species at this late period of civilization, if we can not get what we want. The future of the Chinese does not seem to particularly interest him except as it affects our policies. Probably we could eventually win, even if we did so without the help of Singapore as a base. But it would not be a "short and easy war" as the author recognizes. Few articles I opine have exposed more blatantly a lack of knowledge of the teachings of history about war, of social philosophy and of ethics than this article on "Our Choice in the Far East." It is to be hoped that *Harper's* will soon publish another treatment of the subject from a different standpoint.

LUCIA AMES MEAD.

Boston, Mass.

Outlaw War!

Editor of UNITY:

Have waited until the eleventh hour to renew my subscription at the reduced rate simply because it is so hard to get even $2.00 and this in the face of government taxes draining me for cost of future wars of which I do not approve.

Your magazine with many others coming to my desk give reasons for trying to keep us out of conflicts, yet we do not work enough with the only way and that is to outlaw war. Why don't you indorse the Women's Peace Unions' Senate Joint Resolution No. 6? After the hearing of the munition makers I cannot understand why Senator Vandenberg or Senator Nye would vote for any naval appropriation.

The Moratorium on War as given by Salmon Levinson met my hearty approval and I wrote this up for our two papers, also Mrs. Edna Chaney of Topeka, Kan. giving current events lectures here before large groups gave it for the benefit of her audience, but she said it was so simple we would not do anything about it.

While removing causes of war by freeing natural resources is the only way, we must learn that all we should have the right to exchange is adult service on an equitable basis, which would be hour for hour. I am working with all in the psychology that reason instead of force can settle our difficulties.

I believe your readers would appreciate your printing S. J. Res. 6.

Yours for Peace and Equitism,

MAMIE SCHELLENBERG.

Arkansas City, Kansas

Best in Forty Years

Editor of UNITY:

With forty years or more of UNITY, I have never read any number that I feel can compare favorably with that of July 1, 1935.

T. J. DANSINGBURG.

Rochester, Minn.

About Hero Worship

Editor of UNITY:

I wish to commend the courage shown in the article "A Word About Hero Worship," by Robert Whittaker, in the UNITY of August 5th. To the few of quickened mind it is evident that through the symbol of Jane Addams' life he was deploring all the conservatism of old age; all the confusion of thinking of the typical liberal mind of the 19th century; all the inevitable, but nevertheless deplorable surrender of fine individual courage to the pressure of cruel, subversive and ignorant persecution—of the keen, idealistic, visionary minority to the blind, brutal, over-powering majority.

In her failure, emphasized, as the writer so delicately indicated, by the comparative grandeur and high tenor of her life, is epitomized the tragedy of the evolution of mankind. The mills of the Gods grind slowly and all humanity is the grist that is fed them. More truly than any of us can rightly conceive, the fate of the individual is bound up with the progress—the welfare of the group. No *one* can rise far above the shoulders of another, but shoulder to shoulder the slow climb must be made, as of brother side by side with brother. This fact, at least, was never lost sight of by Jane Addams in her long life. When the majority of us come to realize this simple, sociological fact more fully, much of the battle will have been won, and no single life will have been lived entirely in vain.

(Mrs.) ALICE G. HARRIS.

Polo, Illinois

Citizens May Register Opposition to War

Editor of UNITY:

Your pacifist readers may be interested in the new program of Peace Patriots which includes registering with the County Clerk of New York, for a fee of 25 cents, the names of American-born citizens who wish to express their opposition as conscientious objectors to all wars.

WILLIAM FLOYD,

Director of Peace Patriots, 114 E. 31st St., N. Y. C.

The Field

(*Continued from Page 2*)

training financed and administered by the War Department.

Consequently the CME is engaged in an active opposition campaign. All interested in the organization are asked to report to headquarters any local signs of the establishment of new ROTC units and to organize groups of influential local leaders to combat any move toward the establishment of such ROTC units in their communities.

These are the most immediate concerns of the CME, but they form only a small part of its whole ambitious program. The organization, whose distinguished chairman is Professor George A. Coe, came into being nine years ago solely because of the acute need for concentration on this phase of the peace movement. Almost singlehanded, it still carries on its ambitious work. If the CME were to go out of existence tomorrow, another similar organization would rise to take its place, because the work is so vital that it cannot be ignored. Some idea of the odds against which it works may be gained from the fact that annually Congress appropriates about four million dollars for the ROTC, exclusive of the cost of officers' salaries assigned to duty, and of materials and equipment apportioned from the regular War

Department stock. In all, about three hundred schools and colleges in the country have some form of military training subsidized by the War Department. To fight this octopus-like foe, the CME must rely upon a budget of less than ten thousand dollars annually.

The CME is one of the most picturesque members of the whole peace movement. Even in its more opulent moments, it still resembles very closely its description in the May, 1933 issue of *Harper's Magazine*: "There is that comparative ragamuffin, the Committee on Militarism in Education, which consists, for working purposes, of two young men in a dilapidated back room furnished with chairs that must be sat on carefully lest they fall apart: budget, $8,000, and they're lucky if they get it: luncheons, if any, fifty cent ones, Dutch treat. Yet all over the country the military propagandists are constantly harassed by this Committee and unquestionably would like to put a bounty on the heads of the two young men."

When the CME was founded in 1925, its working program was drawn up on the basis of several definite beliefs. The first was that "The Committee favors the abolition of all compulsory military training in civil educational institutions. It is believed that compulsory military training is un-American, undemocratic, unnecessary for national defense and a step toward militarism. Second: the Committee favors the abolition of all military training in public high schools and withdrawal of Federal aid from private schools of such rank giving military training. . . . Third: the Committee opposes the sales methods of the military training enthusiasts who recommend military drill as physical training, character training, training for citizenship, etc., and who try to popularize it through the use of honorary girl officers, snappy uniforms, subsidies to students, honors, prizes, displays, reviews, etc. Fourth: the Committee is opposed to the Federal subsidizing and War Department control of military training in civil educational institutions as opening the way to centralized bureaucratic interference with the freedom and integrity of educational authority in the individual school, college or university. Fifth: the Committee favors genuine physical education for all students. It believes . . . that it will better prepare our youth for the eventualities of life than military training. Sixth: the Committee advocates the establishment of high school and college courses on the causes of war and methods of international cooperation."

Countless studies of the subject have been made in an effort to determine the actual character-building and citizenship-training value of military training. All impartial reports, including findings by the American Physical Education Association, the National Education Association, and the World Federation of Teachers, reveal that the claims of the militarists are greatly exaggerated. The NEA report states that "the ideals of the kind of obedience and of general conduct aimed at by military exercises are best represented by the word 'martinet' which these exercises long ago contributed to our educational vocabulary—ideals which every teacher who aims at real character-development seeks to avoid. . . .

A recently developed part of the organization's work has to do with combating the militarizing of CCC camps. Last winter the CME took the lead in organizing opposition to the War Department-inspired bills designed to add military drill to the CCC program. In a petition to President Roosevelt, signed by more than 150 prominent educators, churchmen, publicists and others, a powerful protest was voiced. The petition declared: "During the critical early days of your Administration it may have been necessary to rely upon War Department personnel and organization to launch successfully the CCC project. But with the passing of the more serious phase of the crisis, it seems to us, the administration and control of the CCC might well be returned and strictly limited to civilian leadership while, on the other hand, the War Department should be relieved of occupation with such a non-military function so that its personnel may devote their full time to such responsibilities of technical military defense as may ordinarily rest upon them. If changes in the character of the CCC are to be made, it seems to us, they should be in the direction of building it up into a highly trained force of forestry professionals, possibly under the joint jurisdiction of the Division of Forestry of the Department of Agriculture and the National Park Service of the Department of Interior, and entirely free from every taint or suggestion of military control or administration."

An important phase of the work of the CME is its research activities. Its detailed studies of the problems of military training. . . .

The CME is in contact with organized groups and individuals in all parts of the country, fighting the whole issue of military training. Letters continually pour into the New York office from individuals rebelling against compulsory military training in schools and colleges, and asking help from the CME. Here is a typical letter from a college freshman: "Saw your article on military training in the Buffalo *Times*, and am writing for literature and suggestions. Please send two sets, one for me and another for a friend. Would it be possible to get a list of teachers who are opposed to militarism so that I could govern my studies accordingly? I have a living to make after awhile and do not wish to carry such dead wood in my education."

The CME sponsors the cause of such conscientious objectors, and at several colleges has achieved notable results in gaining exemption for such students. At other universities and colleges ROTC units have been abolished altogether. During 1934 such a development took place at DePauw University, while at New York University Arts College and at the University of Minnesota, action was taken to abolish compulsory military drill.

The steps leading up to the present situation, in which the CME is a factor to be reckoned with, have been many and tedious, for the organization has had to build up a whole background of education for its position before it was able to function effectively. During the first phase of its career, its chief work was to expose the philosophy of brutal militarism which was being propagated through the ROTC. So effective was the work of the Committee that much of the "realistic militarism" was deleted from military manuals, bayonet practice was abolished, and military advocates shifted their tack to popularizing and "sugar-coating" military drill.

The second step was to reveal the fake militarism being propagated through the ROTC. The literature of the CME during this period showed up the devices used to make military training more attractive to students, such as smart uniforms,

military balls, prizes and awards, cadet pay, etc.

Third, because of the number of cases in various parts of the country in which conscientious objectors to military training were suspended or otherwise penalized, the CME made it its chief work to sponsor their cause and to get just action for them and to have their educational rights and privileges restored. In two cases court action was undertaken in defense of suspended conscientious ROTC resisters, with the CME providing leadership in raising the necessary funds.

Following the adverse ruling by the U. S. Supreme Court in the case of Hamilton and Reynolds vs. the University of California, the campaign against militarism in education moved forward to its fourth and most recent phase—its legislative phase.

The Supreme Court's decision showed conclusively that it must be by State and National legislation and through the action of regents in tax-supported institutions, rather than through the courts, that exemption from compulsory military training must be obtained. The Morrill Act, establishing the land grant colleges, has been interpreted by both the Attorney General of the United States and former Secretary of Interior Work as permitting the drill to be either compulsory or optional, while the War Department has often pointed out that the National Defense Act places responsibility for the matter upon local authorities.

Meanwhile Congressional opposition to voting funds for compulsory military training grows more vigorous. During the debate in the 74th Congress on Appropriations for the War Department, Representative Marcantonio of New York introduced in the House an amendment to withhold Federal funds from tax-supported colleges where military training is compulsory, in an attempt to make it unnecessary for "young men who are seeking a higher education to goose-step through the campus and mentally goose-step in the classroom."

Representative O'Malley of Wisconsin, speaking for the amendment, said, "the building up of a militaristic machine, the creation of a militaristically inclined class of citizenry in this country, starting with the attempt to mould growing minds into the idea that war is inevitable and must always come, is the surest way to start a war."

Senator Frazier of North Dakota, offered a similar amendment in the Senate. In the debate on this issue, the North Dakota senator presented statistics showing that it costs the government more to maintain an ROTC unit in an institution where military training is compulsory than in an institution where such training is voluntary.

Today, the CME is sponsoring a bill drafted by Kenneth Walser, a New York attorney who serves on the Executive Board of the CME, which it expects soon to have introduced concurrently in the House and Senate. The bill provides for an amendment to the Defense Act which would abolish and prohibit compulsion in military training units maintained by Federal funds.

"HUMANITY"

No publication in existence like it. Published monthly, on a ranch in the shadow of the Rocky Mountains, edited by a plain farmer—whose feet are in the furrow while his eyes are on the stars. Fighting for a New America, a CIVILIZED Civilization. Vibrant with Life, Labor, Love. A torch at the hour of the world's midnight. Not a line of bosh, bluster or bunk in it. One Dollar pays for a full year's subscription, including one free copy of "HELLO HAPPINESS," the book that Nobody can buy—it may make you laugh or swear—but it will make you THINK. It is free with every sub. to HUMANITY—the only way it can be obtained. Back issues of Magazine (when we have them) 25c.

Morton Alexander, Editor, R I B 213, Arvada, Colorado

THE MODERN THINKER

Edited by DAGOBERT D. RUNES, Ph. D.

A Truly International Magazine

For the intelligent reader keenly interested in the affairs of the world, affairs that embrace politics, literature, philosophy, sociology, art, science.

The Modern Thinker has an unbiased and cosmopolitan viewpoint. It has one interest: to present the finest writing by the finest minds. You can find, side by side in *the Modern Thinker*, an iconoclastic essay on the ruthlessness of nature by Llewellyn Powys; George Bernard Shaw on the problem of sterilization; Arnold Zweig on half-Jews and their worries in the modern world. In current issues you will find such articles as "DICTATORS ARE JUVENILES," by George Conrad Ebbert, "IN DEFENSE OF PESSIMISM," by Paul Eldridge, "3,000 MEN DISAPPEAR," by Eugene Bertram Willard.

You will find the MODERN THINKER comprehensive and intensely interesting. There is a special subscription rate at present—$2.00 for one year. Simply enclose this sum (Bills, check, or money order) and mail to THE MODERN THINKER, 310 Riverside Drive, New York, N. Y.

In the Summer Issue of

The New Humanist

A HUMANIST VIEW OF JUDAISM DISCUSSED
By Eugene Kohn and Felix Levy

REGIMENTATION AND LIBERTY
Robert Weston

T. S. ELIOT AND THE DEMON OF THE ABSOLUTE
Wallace Cable Brown

LIFE AND THE PHILOSOPHERS
Horace S. Fries

THE GOLDEN ROAD OF EDUCATION
F. J. Gould

ARE WE SPIRITUALLY BANKRUPT?
Max Kaufman

A SKEPTIC SALVAGES CONSCIENCE
Edwin H. Wilson

Free with each new subscription, any *one* of the following books postpaid: HUMANISM AND NEW WORLD IDEALS by Oliver L. Reiser; HUMANISM IN RELIGION EXAMINED by Robert J. Hutcheon; HUMANIST RELIGION by C. W. Reese.

Yearly $1.50 *Per Copy* 25c
Canadian & Foreign $1.75

Raymond B. Bragg, Editor
Edwin H. Wilson, Managing Editor

Published six times a year by

THE HUMANIST PRESS ASSOCIATION, Inc.

330 South Dearborn Street
Chicago, Illinois